DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 290 750 SP 029 884

AUTHOR Agne, Russell M.
TITLE The Professoriate and the Promise for Reform--Teaching.
PUB DATE Feb 88
NOTE 10p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (New Orleans, LA, February 17-20, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; Comparative Analysis; Educational Change; Educational Research; Higher Education; Institutional Research; *Occupational Aspiration; *Organizational Objectives; Private Colleges; *Teacher Educators; *Teaching Load; *Time Management
IDENTIFIERS *Holmes Group

ABSTRACT

A report is given of the results of four surveys of education faculties between 1981 and 1986, with particular emphasis on findings applicable to the reform issues addressed by "A Nation at Risk" and "Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy." Study subjects at 32 institutions completed a questionnaire requiring information about their faculty status, characteristics about their teaching assignment, research and scholarship, and participation in scholarly and professional associations. Respondents also presented their views on items such as their perceptions about the importance of their work vis a vis the institutional perception of its importance. Data were gathered from 1,186 education faculty members. Ten of the universities are Holmes Group members, nine are not. This paper presents six separate analyses and interpretations on how faculty at Holmes and non-Holmes, and private and public institutions compare on the following questionnaire variables: (1) major efforts between teaching, service, and scholarship; (2) perceived institutional rewards; (3) experience in K-12 education; (4) clock hours per week in the classroom; (5) clock hours per week in clinical supervision; and (6) consulting in schools during the previous two years. (Author/JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED290750

THE PROFESSORIATE AND THE PROMISE FOR REFORM--TEACHING

Russell M. Agne

University of Vermont

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. M. Agne

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP029884

New Orleans
February 19, 1988

Russell M. Agne
University of Vermont

AACTE Presentation:

THE PROFESSORIATE AND THE PROMISE FOR REFORM - TEACHING

ABSTRACT

This presentation reported results of four surveys of education faculties between 1981 and 1986, with particular emphasis on findings applicable to the reform issues addressed by A Nation At Risk (1983) and Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986). Study subjects at 32 institutions completed a questionnaire requiring information about their faculty status, characteristics about their teaching assignment, research and scholarship, and participation in scholarly and professional associations. Respondents also presented their views on items such as their perceptions about the importance of their work vis a vis the institutional perception of its importance.

Data were gathered from 1,186 education faculty members between 1981 and 1986. Institutions were drawn from a national sample in 1981, 1982, and 1983; in 1986 all teacher preparation institutions in a single state were included in the study. In each year, usable return rates exceeded 65%. Of the 32 universities and colleges included in the study, 21 (66%) are public, and 11 (34%) are private. Ten of the universities are Holmes Group members, nine are not.

This paper presented six separate analyses and interpretations in light of Holmes for: (1) Major efforts between teaching, service, and scholarship; (2) Perceived Institutional rewards; (3) Experience in K-12 education; (4) Clock hours per week in the classroom: (5) Clock hours per week in clinical supervision; (6) Consulting in schools during previous two years.

SP 029 884

How do SCDE faculty at Holmes and non-Holmes, and Private and Public institutions compare on questionnaire variables of Teaching and Service?

TEACHING

Faculty at non-Holmes institutions, given a choice, prefer teaching more than do their counterparts at Holmes institutions. When asked to identify where their major academic effort was directed, 78% of non-Holmes faculty valued teaching most, while 52% of Holmes faculty selected teaching as their top choice (Sample: 1982, 1983, 1986). This is a significant difference between the two groups and represents the flip side of the previously reported (by Ed Ducharme) preference of Holmes faculty for scholarship.

MAJOR EFFORTS TRADITIONAL AREAS

(Foil #1)

	HOLMES		NON-HOLMES	
TEACHING	234	52%	291	78%
SERVICE	86	19%	59	16%
SCHOLARSHIP	28	28%	23	6%
		100%		100%

	PRIVATE (N = 247)		PUBLIC (N = 573)	
TEACHING	170	69%	355	62%
SERVICE	42	17%	103	18%
SCHOLARSHIP	35	14%	115	20%
		100%		100%

*Questionnaire Data, Ducharme & Agne: 1982, 1983, 1986

Still focusing on teaching, for comparison we split our sample (1982, 1983, 1986) into private vs. public institutions. We found that 69% of private and 62% of public SCDE faculty selected teaching as their first choice for academic

responsibility. This is a small difference. By the way, faculty at private institutions were less likely to identify scholarship as their first choice of activity compared to public institution faculty (Scholarship: Private 14%; Public - 20%).

Having just looked at how faculty prefer to spend their professional time, we now turn to how they perceive their institutions want them to allocate their energy between teaching, service, and scholarship. We conducted this analysis of our data (Sample: 1982, 1983, 1986) for both the Holmes/non-Holmes, and Private/Public categories of SCDE institutions.

PERCEIVED INSTITUTIONAL REWARDS

(Foil #2)

	HOLMES		NON-HOLMES	
Teaching	40	9%	169	47%
Service	20	4%	30	8%
Scholarship	387	87%	162	45%
N=	447	100%	361	100%
	PRIVATE		PUBLIC	
Teaching	78	32%	131	23%
Service	16	7%	34	6%
Scholarship	150	61%	399	71%
N=	244	100%	564	100%

47% of non-Holmes faculty believe that their institutions reward teaching the most, while only 9% of Holmes faculty hold that view. This is a better than 5-1 margin for teaching at non-Holmes institutions. These findings, however, are better understood when placed in relationship to scholarship, which was identified as the top institutional priority by 45% of non-Holmes faculty, and by 87% of Holmes faculty.

If faculty perform best in settings where their personal work priorities and institutional expectations are somewhat concordant neither Holmes nor Non-Holmes faculty are really at home with the place of teaching in their professional lives. For non-Holmes faculty, 78% (F 1) rated teaching their personal preference, while 47% (F 2) believed that their own institutions placed it most important. On the other hand, for Holmes faculty, 52% (F 1) rated teaching their preference, while but 9% (F 2) believed that their institutions did so. While it may be inappropriate to identify this seeming mismatch between work preference and employer expectation as alienated labor, that notion comes to mind.

Perceived institutional rewards for teaching at private and public institutions were also examined. Here, 32% of faculty at private institutions judged teaching most rewarded, while 23% of faculty at public institutions did so.

One of the variables investigated each of the four years that we used our questionnaire was teaching experience in lower schools. "Lower schools" was the designation used by Harry Judge in his book American Graduate Schools of Education to refer to pre-college (preschool-Grade 12) schools. Here is our data both for Holmes vs. non-Holmes and Private compared to Public SCDE's.

TEACHING EXPERIENCE IN LOWER SCHOOLS*

(Foil #3)

		HOLMES			NON-HOLMES	
YES		426	63%		339	67%
NO		252	37%		169	33%
	N=	678	100%	N=	508	100%
		PRIVATE			PUBLIC	
YES		148	57%		617	67%
NO		113	43%		308	33%
	N=	261	100%	N=	925	100%

*Questionnaire derived data, Ducharme & Agne: 1981, 1982, 1983, 1986

These (above F 3) data can help us better understand the attributes of SCDE faculty, and focus attention on distinctions between institution types. Such comparisons, however, are made with caution because our direct unit of analysis was individual faculty and inferences about institutional units are made at some statistical risk.

There was no significant difference between Holmes and non-Holmes faculty in their claims of teaching experience in the lower schools. 63% of Holmes faculty possessed this characteristic, while 67% of non-Holmes faculty did so. Our data set also identified lower school experience in such other capacities as counselor, department chair, principal, and superintendent. These findings were not prepared for this presentation, but they could be shared upon request.

To the extent that pre-higher education experience in the classroom is important to creating better teacher educators, then neither Holmes or non-Holmes faculty have a clear edge. Further, we do not make much of the 4% higher percentage of lower school experience reported by non-Holmes faculty. Nevertheless, those who have been around teacher preparation for even a short time sense how important it is to our students that their education professors have taught "real kids in the real world," and the more recently, the better.

Let us now look at this same variable for private vs. public SCDE faculty. Faculty at Public SCDE's report teaching experience in lower schools somewhat more frequently than do faculty at private SCDE's. 67% of public SCDE faculty reported teaching experience in the lower schools, while 57% of private SCDE faculty did so. In any case, of the four subgroups in this analysis (Holmes, non-Holmes, Private, Public), the Private SCDE faculty were least likely to have spent time teaching in the lower schools (i.e., only 57% have done so).

Our questionnaire also inquired about faculty work load per week as well as clock hours per week in the classroom. The former, work load per week, might have been shared with you, but I didn't think comic relief would be needed at this

point in our presentation. So, clock hours per week in the classroom is the variable in this foil (#4).

CLOCK HOURS PER WEEK IN CLASSROOM*

(Foil #4)

Clock Hours/Week	HOLMES		NON-HOLMES	
3 or LESS	97	17%	20	9%
4-9	376	64%	106	47%
10+	110	19%	101	45%
N=	583	100%	227	100%
	PRIVATE		PUBLIC	
3 or LESS	13	9%	104	16%
4-9	92	61%	390	59%
10+	45	30%	166	25%
N=	150	100%	660	100%

*Questionnaire derived data, Ducharme & Agne, 1981, 1982, 1986

If we regard three or less classroom hours per week as a light teaching load, then Holmes faculty have an almost 2-1 "lightness" advantage over non-Holmes faculty. (17% of Holmes faculty report teaching 3 or fewer hours per week, while 9% of non-Holmes faculty report that amount.) At the other extreme, if 10 or more classroom hours per week is regarded as a heavy teaching load, then non-Holmes faculty report having heavier classroom loads, than Holmes faculty, this time by a margin of greater than 2-1. (19% of Holmes faculty report teaching 10 or more hours per week, while 45% of non-Holmes faculty report that amount of teaching.)

Again, a reconsideration of a point that Ed Ducharme raised earlier is brought into focus: it is a "goodness of fit' issue between what faculty would ideally choose to do with their time and what the institutional needs are. If Holmes institutions are going to work more intensively in teacher preparation,

then faculty will be needed to do more teaching. Where they come from is a question. Of course, closer affiliation with school-based personnel (clinical settings) as Holmes proposed, could reduce that gap somewhat.

Let's look now at the relative teaching responsibilities of private and public SCDE faculty.

In our sample, faculty at private institutions reported lighter teaching loads (9% report 3 or fewer hours/week) than their counterparts at public institutions (16% report 3 or fewer hours/week). As before, lighter was defined as 3 or less contact hours per week. Also, faculty at private institutions have a heavier classroom teaching load than public SCDE faculty at the highest end of our three category spectrum (light, medium, heavy). (30% of private SCDE faculty have 10 or more contact hours of classroom teaching per week, while 25% of public SCDE faculty report loads of that magnitude).

SUPERVISION

One additional variable is on interest, that being:

CLOCK HOURS PER WEEK IN SUPERVISION*

(Foil #5)

	HOLMES (N=96)	NON-HOLMES (N-114)
0-5	65%	59%
6-10	22%	25%
11-15	9%	10%
16-20	3%	1%
21+	1%	5%
	100%	100%

*1986 Questionnaire Only

This variable was investigated for but one questionnaire year, 1986.

No striking differences are apparent between Holmes and non-Holmes faculty on clinical supervision responsibility.

Our sixth and last analysis was consulting in schools.

CONSULTATIONS IN SCHOOLS DURING PAST 2 YEARS

(Fall #6)

CONSULTATION STATUS	HOLMES (N = 676)	NON-HOLMES (N = 507)
YES	63%	59%
NO	37%	41%
	100%	100%
	PRIVATE (N = 259)	PUBLIC (N = 924)
YES	58%	62%
NO	42%	38%
	100%	100%

(Composite for years 1981, 1982, 1983, 1986

Here we sought to determine if there were differences between Holmes and non-Holmes faculty in the incidence of consulting in lower schools during the past two years. *(NOTE: We have no way of knowing the character of that consultation - it could be trivial or powerful)*

Notice that there are only minor ones (63% Holmes to 59% non-Holmes faculty). Between private compared to public SCDE faculty, such consulting was again not much different (58% private, compared to 63% public).

Suggestions For Further Information on This Research

*Ducharme, Edward R. and Agne, Russell M., "The Education Professoriate: A Research Based Perspective," Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. XXXIII, Number 6, December, 1982, pp. 30-36.

*Ducharme, Edward R. and Agne, Russell M., "Professors of Education - Beasts of Burden, Facilitators or Academicians," Journal of Human Behavior and Learning, Vol. 4, Number 2, 1987, pp. 1-8.